

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 1 through 33 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115279 A1 to Quine et al. ("Quine"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Present Invention

The present invention teaches a method, system and computer program product for predicting/completing the addressee field in an electronic mail system, in which several aspects of the body of the user's sent and/or received mail, is analyzed, using text mining and/or data mining techniques, for associating the most probable addressee for a given e-mail letter.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A computerized method for predicting a correct addressee to be filled-in in an addressee field in an e-mail system, whereby user-related history information, including the user's prior sent and/or received e-mail, is analyzed for associating the most probable addressee for an e-mail to be addressed, comprising the steps of:

analyzing at least one of the following attributes of said user-related history information and of said e-mail to be addressed

- a subject line of said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the length of said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the language used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- a time associated with said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;

the vocabulary used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
topics discussed in the body of said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
the salutation form used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
the closing form used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
whereby Text Mining methods are used to associate attribute values with respective addressees, thus yielding a plurality of single analysis results usable for said prediction, and
weighting the plurality of said single analysis results to provide a Data Mining Model adapted to offer at least one top favorite addressee proposal as a prediction result.

Claims 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27 recite similar language.

The present invention uses text mining methods to mine the several elements of the body of the user's prior sent and/or received e-mail in order to find attribute text that can be associated, using data mining methods, with the individual respective email addresses of the prior email. As recited in claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 23 and 28, the attributes of the prior email which are analyzed include not just the email address, but the subject line, particular vocabulary used, the language used, the topics, as well as other attributes. Additionally, the present invention gives weightings to the various analyses which are done. Thus, novel aspects of the claimed invention include the use of text mining and data mining methods on several attributes of the user's prior email and the weighting of the results of the data mining. These aspects of the invention are expressly claimed in each pending claim

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115279 to Quine et al.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115279 A1 to Quine et al. ("Quine") teaches a method for providing a corrected e-mail address, whereby the domain portion of the e-mail address is parsed and, referring to a domain format rule database, a format rule or requirement

corresponding to the domain is identified. In Quine, only a newly sent email from a user is examined and only the email address portion of that email is examined. The email address of the new email is compared to external databases that contain information about the correct spelling and formatting of people's names, such as from a phone book, and of domain names, such as that used by an internet service provider (ISP) or a corporation.

The Cited Prior Art Does Not Anticipate the Claimed Invention

The MPEP and case law provide the following definition of anticipation for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 102:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Company of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

The Examiner Has Not Established a *Prima Facie* Case of Anticipation

The present claimed invention uses text mining and data mining methods on the text in the body of the user's prior email and gives weightings to the results of the data mining. In contrast, Quine does not examine a user's prior email, does not examine the email's text, does not use text mining or data mining methods and does not give any weightings to anything. Quine merely checks the spelling of the name and domain in an email address of a currently sent email against an external database of names and/or domains.

In a telephone interview with the Examiner conducted on February 26, 2008, Applicants pointed out to the Examiner that Quine taught only checking the email address of a current email

and did not teach checking the text in the other parts of the email as in the present invention. Applicants further stressed that, although Quine uses a database, there is nothing inherent in the use of a database or in anywhere else in Quine that suggests using text mining and data mining methods as in the present claimed invention. Similarly, Applicants pointed out that nowhere does Quine suggest weighting the results of the text and data mining as claimed in the present invention.

In the Office Actions of December 31, 2007 and July 12, 2007, the Examiner stated that Figs. 5A-B, 6, 7 and 9 and paragraphs [0065] to [0075] of Quine disclose the entire invention recited in the independent claims of the present application, with the exception of the weighting of the analysis results. However, the cited passage discloses only that the email address of a newly sent email is compared to external databases of the correct spelling of people's names and the correct formatting of known domain name formats. Nowhere does Quine use of text mining and data mining methods on the text of the body of the user's prior email as is claimed in each independent claim of the present invention. For this reason, Quine does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27.

Additionally, in the Office Actions, the Examiner stated that Fig. 9 and paragraphs [0074], [0075] and [0092] of to [0095] of Quine disclose weighting the plurality of said single analysis results to provide a Data Mining Model adapted to offer at least one top favorite addressee proposal as a prediction result. However, the cited language and figure disclose only percentages of use of various email address formats within various domains. Nowhere in the cited passage or anywhere else does Quine disclose weightings given to the results of different

analyses as in the present claimed invention. For this additional reason, Quine does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27.

Accordingly, each of the independent claims (Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27), and all claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Quine and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

February 29, 2008
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
1101 Market Street
Suite 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189